

1 [Parties and Counsel Listed on Signature Pages]
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE: SOCIAL MEDIA ADOLESCENT
ADDICTION/PERSONAL INJURY
PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

This Document Relates To:

ALL ACTIONS

MDL No. 3047

Case No. 4:22-md-03047-YGR (PHK)

**AGENDA AND JOINT STATEMENT FOR
JANUARY 17, 2025, CASE MANAGEMENT
CONFERENCE**

Judge: Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers

Magistrate Judge: Hon. Peter H. Kang

1 **I. Agenda for Case Management Conference (“CMC”)**

2 The Parties offer the below proposed agenda for the CMC scheduled for January 17, 2025:

- 3 • Meta: Meta’s Administrative Motion to Relate Insurance Coverage Matter (§ IV(D))
- 4 • PI/SD Plaintiffs and Defendants: Parties’ proposals regarding inter-circuit assignments
5 for directly-filed bellwether cases asserting *Lexecon* objections (§ V(A))
- 6 • PI/SD Plaintiffs: Plaintiffs’ proposal to narrow Personal Injury (“PI”) and School
7 District (“SD”) bellwether discovery pools (§ V(B))
- 8 • Meta: Relief sought with respect to California and South Carolina (§ V(C))
- 9 • State AGs: Dismissals while State AGs’ objection to state agency order is pending
10 (§ V(D))
- 11 • Meta: Anticipated request to place State AGs on separate trial track (§ V(E))

12 **II. Joint JCCP Update**

13 At the last JCCP status conference, held December 17, 2024, Judge Kuhl (1) issued
14 guidance and rulings with respect to various PI bellwether discovery issues; (2) issued a tentative
15 schedule, including deadlines for general causation expert reports (April 18, 2025) and *Sargon*
16 motions on general causation experts (July 28, 2025), and a first trial date of November 25, 2025;
17 and (3) stated that a tentative ruling on the parties’ competing proposed jury instructions on
18 negligence and causation would be forthcoming. Judge Kuhl invited the parties to submit
19 comments on the Court’s tentative schedule in their joint statement for the next CMC, which will
20 occur on January 15; a copy of the parties’ joint statement will be emailed to the Judge Gonzalez
21 Rogers after it is submitted on January 13. The JCCP Court’s December 17, 2024 Minute Order
22 and tentative schedule are attached as **Exhibits A and B**.

23 There are 17 plaintiffs remaining in the JCCP PI bellwether discovery pool, following
24 voluntary dismissals by three bellwether plaintiffs. In total, Defendants anticipate noticing 68
25 depositions of bellwether plaintiffs, family members, or treating physicians. To date, the parties
26 have cooperatively scheduled 56 of those depositions to take place between December 2024 and
27 February 2025. Depositions commenced on December 20. As of January 10, 12 depositions
28 have been completed.

As the Court is aware, Judge Kuhl sustained demurrers as to representative SD plaintiffs

1 from four states. Thereafter, the court stayed the remaining SD cases in the JCCP pending
 2 plaintiffs' appeal. On January 6, the JCCP SD plaintiffs from all states other than the four states
 3 at issue on the demurrer (approximately 400 SDs in total) filed a motion to lift the stay to allow
 4 SD plaintiffs the opportunity to voluntarily dismiss their cases and re-file in this MDL.
 5 Defendants intend to oppose that motion.

6 On January 8, Judge Kuhl issued an order (*see Exhibit C*) overruling Defendants'
 7 demurrer to 7 JCCP plaintiffs' non-product negligent failure to warn claims under California law.

8 **III. Joint Discovery Update**

9 A copy of the following submissions and orders, filed or issued after the last MDL CMC
 10 held on November 22, will be sent by email to Judge Gonzalez Rogers after this CMC Statement
 11 is filed: Discovery Management Order No. 12 (November 26, 2024, ECF 1380); Parties'
 12 Discovery Management Conference ("DMC") Statement for December 11, 2024 DMC
 13 (December 4, 2024, ECF 1408); Discovery Management Order No. 13 (December 20, 2024, ECF
 14 1479); Order re Schedule for State Agency Document Production (December 31, 2024, ECF
 15 1495); Parties' joint DMC Statement for January 16, 2025 DMC (January 10, 2025, ECF 1512).

16 **IV. Joint Update on Appeals and Other Matters**

17 **A. Defendants' Motions for Certification for Interlocutory Appeal**

18 On December 16, 2024, Defendants filed motions to certify for interlocutory appeal the
 19 Court's School District Motion to Dismiss ("MTD") Orders. *See* ECF 1460, 1462. The PI/SD
 20 Plaintiffs intend to oppose the motions. Plaintiffs' oppositions are due January 14, 2025,
 21 Defendants' replies are due January 28, 2025, and the motions will be heard at the February 12,
 22 2025 CMC. *See* ECF 1490.

23 **B. State AGs' Anticipated 1292 Motion and Response to Defendants' 1292 24 Motion**

25 Meta filed a notice of conditional joinder in a supplemental motion filed by Snap and
 26 YouTube to certify the Court's October 15, 2024 Order (ECF 1214). ECF 1462, 1463. The AGs
 27 intend to file a response and a motion to certify the Court's order dismissing their unfairness
 28 claims under Section 230. The PI/SD Plaintiffs intend to oppose this motion given the rulings

1 contained in these orders on PI/SD Plaintiffs' consumer protection and misrepresentation claims.

2 **C. Notices of Appeal of Failure-to-Warn MTD Orders at ECF 1214 and 1267**

3 On November 14, 2024, Meta filed a notice of appeal of the MTD Orders at ECF 1214
 4 and 1267. ECF 1330. Since that time, TikTok has joined Meta's appeal (ECF 1389), and the
 5 AGs and PI/SD Plaintiffs have filed Notices of Conditional Cross-Appeals (ECF 1386, 1388) and
 6 motions in the Ninth Circuit to dismiss Meta's and TikTok's appeals. Briefing on the MTDs, and
 7 any cross-MTDs the conditional cross-appeals, will be completed as of January 28, 2025. The
 8 appeals have been consolidated, and deadlines for merits briefing are stayed pending resolution of
 9 the MTDs.

10 **D. Meta's Administrative Motion to Relate Insurance Coverage Matter**

11 On January 7, Meta filed an administrative motion (ECF 1504) to consider whether a
 12 coverage action it filed on December 30 in N.D. Cal., in response to a declaratory relief action
 13 filed in Delaware by two of Meta's insurers, should be related to this MDL. The insurers in
 14 Delaware seek to avoid their duty to defend Meta in the MDL on the purported grounds that
 15 Plaintiffs supposedly do not seek damages "because of" bodily injury, and that Plaintiffs' injuries
 16 supposedly were expected or intended. Meta's coverage action asks this Court to suspend
 17 litigation between Meta and its insurers, including in Delaware. The coverage action therefore
 18 satisfies the relatedness requirements under L.R. 3-12(a).

19 **V. Parties' Additional Submissions**

20 **A. InterCircuit Assignments for Bellwether Cases Asserting *Lexecon* Objections**

21 The Parties agree with this Court's suggested path to facilitate the intercircuit assignment
 22 of two bellwether cases asserting *Lexecon* objections that were directly filed in this MDL. ECF
 23 1383 at 3. The Parties will prepare a stipulation setting forth the following: Plaintiffs Dymand
 24 McNeal (No. 23-cv-01092) and DeKalb County School District (No. 23-cv-05733) will re-file
 25 their cases in E.D. Pa. and the N.D. Ga., respectively. Defendants will then tag the cases for
 26 transfer, without Plaintiffs' opposition, to this MDL. Upon transfer, Plaintiffs will dismiss
 27 without prejudice the original, directly-filed cases, as replaced by the two newly-transferred
 28 actions.

1 **B. PI/SD Plaintiffs' Proposal for Narrowing Bellwether Discovery Pools**

2 **PI/SD Plaintiffs' Position.** As previewed during the October (Hr'g Tr. 29:7-32:11) and
 3 November (Hr'g Tr. 7:23-8:8) CMCs, the Parties have been meeting and conferred regarding the
 4 potential narrowing of the PI and SD bellwether discovery pools before experts disclosures. In
 5 light of the Court's guidance, the PI/SD Plaintiffs proposed that each side strike 2 bellwether
 6 cases from the cases it originally selected for the bellwether discovery pools one week after the
 7 Court's approval. The remaining discovery pools would then include 7 PI bellwether cases¹ and
 8 8 SD bellwether cases for remaining fact and expert discovery. On May 23, 2025 at 12:00 p.m.
 9 (CMO No. 18, ECF 1290), the Court would then select 5 cases from each bellwether discovery
 10 pool to form the bellwether trial pools, for a total of 10, consistent with Step 2 of the bellwether
 11 selection process outlined in CMO No. 10, at 4-5 (ECF 604).

12 Defendants are opposed to any narrowing of the bellwether pools prior to expert
 13 disclosures and have proposed, at most, each side striking one of the other side's SD bellwether
 14 picks. As previously explained to the Court, Plaintiffs' proposal to narrow the bellwether
 15 discovery pools now was made for efficiency purposes and to reduce the burdens for each side
 16 arising from conducting expert discovery on a total of 24 bellwethers. Defendants hypothesize a
 17 parade of horrors that would ensue from this approach, but their concerns are hyperbole.
 18 Winnowing the pools in the limited manner Plaintiffs propose occurring now would not inhibit
 19 representative bellwether cases from being tried because it would only limit the discovery pool,
 20 not determine the ultimate trial pool. Thus the Court and the Parties would still have guidance
 21 from case-specific expert reports prior to additional narrowing to arrive at the trial pool (and to be
 22 clear, such guidance would in any event only be available from *Plaintiffs'* experts' reports under
 23 the Court's schedule (ECF 1290)). Plaintiffs' proposal that each side strike its own picks also
 24 addresses the concern acknowledged by *Meta* at the prior CMC (Hr'g Tr. 30:17-31:21) that

25
 26 ¹ Plaintiffs advised Defendants that Plaintiff Hawthorne has decided to dismiss her action with
 27 prejudice. Plaintiff Hawthorne just recently reached majority at which point she necessarily had
 28 to decide independently whether to continue her claim. As Plaintiffs advised Defendants, her
 father has recently been hospitalized with a life-threatening situation. No negative information
 recently came to light and Defendants' insinuation as to Plaintiff Hawthorne's motive to dismiss
 her case is baseless.

1 instead striking the other side's picks would result in the Parties simply targeting the strongest of
 2 each other's picks. Defendants are now in possession of hundreds of thousands of documents
 3 from the bellwether Plaintiffs, and Meta's argument that Plaintiffs have more information on their
 4 clients does not favor one method over the other. Plaintiffs' proposal that each Party would only
 5 be permitted to strike its own picks is a self-executing process that avoids gamesmanship.

6 In addition, there is nothing about narrowing the discovery pools now that would cause a
 7 plaintiff to decide to voluntarily dismiss their case. While voluntary dismissals—or settlements—
 8 may occur at any stage of litigation, PI Plaintiff bellwether depositions are scheduled and counsel
 9 are not anticipating additional dismissals. If the Court nonetheless believes it necessary to address
 10 Plaintiff Hawthorne's voluntary dismissal, Defendants could be permitted to veto one of
 11 Plaintiffs' two strikes, meaning Plaintiffs would have to keep the vetoed strike and instead strike
 12 another.

13 For the above reasons, Plaintiffs' proposal that each side strike 2 bellwether cases from
 14 the cases it originally selected for the bellwether discovery pool should be adopted.

15 **Defendants' Position.** Plaintiffs' proposal for narrowing the PI bellwether discovery
 16 pool would contravene the existing Court-ordered process for exercising strikes; limit the Court's
 17 ability to fashion representative trial pools; and deprive the Court and the Parties of guidance
 18 from expert reports before the pool is narrowed. As to the SD cases, where expert discovery is
 19 expected to impose significant expense on the Parties, if the Court is inclined to allow additional
 20 strikes before expert reports are due, each side should be allowed to strike one additional case
 21 (beyond the single strike already allowed at bellwether trial selection), regardless of which Party
 22 selected the case. In addition, for every PI or SD bellwether case that Plaintiffs voluntarily
 23 dismiss, Defendants should be permitted to strike one additional case (from the entire discovery
 24 bellwether pool) during bellwether trial selection.

25 First, Plaintiffs' proposed approach to narrowing the bellwether discovery pools—by
 26 having each side strike two of *its own picks* from each pool, and removing the Parties' ability to
 27 exercise their existing strike on the other side's picks—is contrary to the method this Court
 28 already ordered for selecting bellwether trial pools, and the opposite of how pool strikes

1 ordinarily are exercised in MDLs. This Court previously ordered that each side could exercise
 2 one strike of its choice during trial bellwether selection, regardless of which side originally
 3 selected the case. CMO 10 (ECF 604) at 4-5. Plaintiffs' proposal would eliminate those strikes
 4 entirely, depriving Defendants of the ability to exercise *any* strikes of Plaintiffs' picks. There is
 5 good reason why MDL courts do not limit parties to strikes of only that party's original picks:
 6 plaintiffs have unique information about which of their clients is most likely to proceed to trial
 7 (an insight their document productions shed no light on for Defendants); and the corresponding
 8 ability to voluntarily dismiss any case. This effectively allows them to unilaterally strike any
 9 defense pick they no longer wish to pursue. Plaintiffs' proposed approach therefore inflicts a
 10 one-sided disadvantage on Defendants, by forcing them to eliminate some of their own picks and
 11 precluding them from eliminating any of Plaintiffs', while Plaintiffs retain the ability to
 12 voluntarily dismiss, at any time, any defense picks.

13 Indeed, on January 3—after some significant negative information came to light about an
 14 individual Plaintiff's father—Plaintiffs informed Defendants that they plan to dismiss one of
 15 Defendants' original bellwether picks (*Hawthorne*), saying that the Plaintiff's father is facing an
 16 unspecified medical issue and “the Plaintiffs' immediate priority is Mr. Hawthorne's health.”
 17 Especially given that dismissal, the Court should reject a proposal that would exacerbate
 18 Defendants' disadvantage by requiring them to strike another of their own picks now, and barring
 19 them from striking any of Plaintiffs' picks. If anything, the Court should, during trial bellwether
 20 selection, permit Defendants to strike one additional case for every bellwether case Plaintiffs
 21 voluntarily dismiss. That would counter-balance *Hawthorne* (and any other cases) falling out of
 22 the bellwether pool at Plaintiffs' election, maintaining a representative pool.²

23 Second, Plaintiffs' proposed approach would curtail the Court's ability to exercise its
 24

25 ² Plaintiffs suggest Defendants should instead be permitted merely to veto one of the two strikes
 26 that Plaintiffs would, under their proposal, be permitted to exercise on Plaintiffs' own picks - but
 27 with Plaintiffs then permitted to strike a different one of their picks. But that would not offset the
 prejudice to Defendants from Plaintiffs having already (effectively) stricken one of Defendants'
 picks, because it would result in an imbalanced pool consisting (under Plaintiffs' approach) of 4
 Plaintiff picks and only 3 Defendant picks.

1 discretion to narrow the bellwether discovery pools “organic[ally]” to form representative trial
 2 pools. 3/22/24 CMC Tr. at 16:9-12. It would shrink the already-small PI bellwether discovery
 3 pool (originally consisting of 12 cases) to only 7 cases,³ in turn reducing the number of cases this
 4 Court may remove from the pool—from 5 cases (under CMO 10), to only 2 cases.

5 *Third*, Plaintiffs’ approach would prevent the Parties and Court from having the benefit of
 6 expert reports *before* the discovery pools are narrowed to trial pools. This is the third time the PI
 7 Plaintiffs have suggested moving bellwether trial selection *before* expert reports are due. *See*
 8 2/23/24 CMC Tr. at 92:8-16; 10/25/24 CMC Tr. at 29:7-13. In both prior instances, the Court
 9 clearly stated that it had purposefully set expert report deadlines to occur *before* bellwether trial
 10 selection, to ensure the Parties and Court have fulsome information about all bellwethers before
 11 cases are selected for the trial pool—including expert opinions regarding causation. *See* 2/23/24
 12 CMC Tr. at 92:19-93:15; 10/25/24 CMC Tr. at 29:16-24. Nothing has changed that would
 13 justify a new approach.

14 C. Relief Sought by Meta with Respect to California and South Carolina

15 **Meta’s Position.** At the November 22 CMC, the Court addressed the refusal of certain
 16 agencies in California and South Carolina to engage in the Court-ordered meet-and-confer
 17 process on Meta’s requests for production of documents (“RFPs”). Following the CMC, the
 18 Court issued CMO 19, noting that “one cannot refuse compliance because they disagree with a
 19 court’s decision and consequences will flow,” ECF 1383 at 3, and directed Meta to submit a brief
 20 as to what relief it was seeking. *Id.*

21 Meta has not yet submitted such a brief because, since the November 22 CMC, it has
 22 continued to negotiate in good faith with the agencies at issue in an effort to resolve document
 23 issues. These negotiations have involved substantial efforts and meaningful concessions on
 24 Meta’s part. Meta has reached agreements with the SC agencies on a document production
 25 process that they will follow to meet their discovery obligations. Discussions with CA are still

26
 27 ³ The PI bellwether pool will now consist of only 11 cases, following the January 3 decision by
 28 bellwether Plaintiff Hawthorne to dismiss her case. Notably, 3 JCCP bellwethers dismissed their
 cases on the eve of depositions, raising the specter of additional MDL dismissals as depositions
 approach.

1 ongoing, including an in-person conferral that is scheduled for January 14. Accordingly, Meta
 2 does not at this time intend to seek sanctions from the District Court against CA or SC for these
 3 specific agencies' earlier non-compliance, but reserves the right to do so in the future should
 4 negotiations fail to yield a suitable resolution.

5 **California Executive Agencies' Position.** On December 18, 2024, Meta served Rule 45
 6 subpoenas on the California Executive Agencies; the agencies accepted service and have already
 7 begun producing responsive documents on the schedule ordered by Magistrate Judge Kang. The
 8 California Executive Agencies have been meeting and conferring with Meta regarding the scope
 9 and breadth of search terms and appropriate limiters that are tailored to the issues in the case, and
 10 will continue to meet and confer in an effort to reach agreement. In the meanwhile, the California
 11 Executive Agencies continue to produce responsive, non-privileged documents.

12 **South Carolina AG's Position.** The South Carolina Attorney General's Office reached
 13 an agreement with Meta for obtaining the requested documents from the South Carolina
 14 Governor's Office and other agencies. We are in the process of reviewing those documents and
 15 plan to produce the relevant and non-privileged documents within our deadline for substantial
 16 completion. The previous dispute over obtaining their documents is moot.

17 **D. Dismissals While State AGs' Objection to State Agency Order Is Pending**

18 There were originally 35 State AGs with lawsuits pending in this MDL. On September 6,
 19 2024, Magistrate Judge Kang issued an order granting in part, and denying in part, Meta's motion
 20 to compel discovery from state agencies. ECF 1117. The State AGs filed their objection on
 21 September 20, 2024, and the Court heard argument on October 25, 2024. Resolution of the AGs'
 22 objection remains pending. Since the order, four States—North Dakota, Georgia, Montana, and
 23 Florida—have dismissed their cases against Meta (with two of them refiling in state court but
 24 without COPPA claims). Other State AGs—including Michigan and Missouri—are likewise
 25 considering dismissing some or all of their claims against Meta as a result of the state agency
 26 discovery order. Another State—Maine—is in discussions with Meta about dismissing its state-
 27 law claims (and asserting only a COPPA claim). These dismissals, if effectuated, would leave 25
 28 states that are still subject to the agency discovery at issue (all but the 4 states that would be

1 asserting only COPPA claims).

2 **E. Meta's Anticipated Request to Place State AGs on Separate Trial Track**

3 **Meta's Position.** Meta has undertaken enormous efforts to obtain from the States subject
 4 to agency discovery compliance with the Court's discovery orders. This has been challenging, as
 5 the States and their agencies have repeatedly violated the Court's orders and missed deadlines for
 6 proposing, negotiating, or agreeing on search terms and custodians for Meta's RFPs, *see ECF*
 7 1291, 1292, 1299, 1380, 1479, among other issues, delaying progress. As Meta proceeds to
 8 depositions of State witnesses, the States have made clear that they will continue to resist
 9 reasonable discovery. Setting aside the extensive resources this has caused Meta to expend, this
 10 delay has prejudiced Meta's ability to progress the States' cases. For example, as of December
 11 23, Meta had received only 32,604 documents total from 14 of the States at issue.⁴ Nine of those
 12 14 States had produced volumes in only the tens or hundreds of documents; one had produced
 13 none. A number of States still have not agreed on basic parameters for document discovery,
 14 including some that—after improperly delaying discovery for months—are now seeking to avoid
 15 it on the purported ground that there is no time left. Even those States that have agreed on
 16 parameters are not required to substantially complete document productions until late January or
 17 early February (ECF 1495.1)—nearly three months after Meta substantially completed its
 18 production of documents, which now total 2 million.

19 The States' prior anemic production efforts, statements from individual State counsel

20 ⁴ That the *State AGs* substantially completed their (limited) productions last summer is beside the
 21 point. Most of the relevant documents will come from the agencies—documents the State AGs
 22 outright refused *for months* to provide. Far from having “marginal relevance” the agency
 23 discovery Meta seeks is central to Meta’s defense, as Magistrate Judge Kang has repeatedly
 24 recognized. *See, e.g.*, 12/11/24 DMC Tr. at 156:3-21 (“the scope of discovery is certainly broader
 25 than the scope of plaintiffs’ claims,” and “part of [Meta’s] theory of defense is that there are these
 26 alternate stressors,” which are “within … the realm of discoverable information” from agencies).
 27 The States’ continued mischaracterization of Meta’s discovery as “extraordinarily broad” is thus
 28 also incorrect, and ignores the enormous concessions Meta has made in negotiations by (i)
 proposing reasonable search terms and custodians to States that failed, despite being ordered, to
 make those proposals; (ii) substantially narrowing Meta’s proposals based on agencies’ claims of
 burden (which those agencies must substantiate); (iii) removing more than 50 agencies from the
 search term process; and (iv) working with agencies to identify alternative methods of targeted
 collections.

1 about their inability to comply with future deadlines, and past violations of prior substantial
 2 completion deadlines all raise substantial questions about whether the States will meet the most
 3 recent deadlines set by Magistrate Judge Kang. But even if they do so, Meta already has been
 4 prejudiced. To illustrate, whereas the States had roughly five months between Meta’s substantial
 5 completion deadline and the States’ deadline to depose Meta witnesses, Meta will have only
 6 approximately two months to prepare for and complete potentially 100 State depositions.
 7 (Because of the multitude of States suing, even a modest number of State depositions, such as
 8 three per State, leads to a large number of total depositions.) And this compressed deposition
 9 period will occur at a time when the States are conducting a high volume of Meta witness
 10 depositions, including the most senior Meta witnesses.

11 Meta has a pending request to seek relief from Magistrate Judge Kang for the States’
 12 violations of the Court’s orders (ECF 1471). However, Judge Kang has made clear that requests
 13 for relief from the schedule must be made with the District Court. *See* 12/11/24 DMC Tr. at
 14 114:1-22. Accordingly, Meta seeks the Court’s guidance on a timetable for seeking such relief—
 15 which will include expanding the time for Meta to complete State depositions and,
 16 correspondingly, the time by which the States may proceed to trial—so the Court may hear
 17 argument if it wishes at the February CMC. By then, the Parties will know whether at least some
 18 States have met their late January/early February substantial completion obligations, the volume
 19 of documents Meta will need to analyze to prepare for depositions, and the extent to which the
 20 States’ discovery positions have prejudiced Meta’s ability to complete depositions.

21 **State AGs’ Position.** Meta’s allegations are at best misleading and at worst patently
 22 false. The State AGs substantially completed production of documents from their own offices on
 23 August 30, 2024, nearly four months ago, which is in no way an “anemic” effort. And despite the
 24 fact that Meta is seeking extraordinarily broad discovery with at best marginal relevance to the
 25 issues in this case, the State AGs have worked diligently and collaboratively with state agency
 26 counsel to satisfy Magistrate Judge Kang’s orders regarding agency discovery. The State AGs
 27 and relevant agencies have made and continue to make significant progress in completing this
 28 discovery; state agencies have generally begun document productions and are moving towards

1 substantial completion.

2 The State AGs are evaluating Meta's request regarding the discovery and trial schedule–
3 including Meta's detailed argument above, which the State AGs dispute. The State AGs will be
4 prepared to discuss Meta's request in person at the CMC.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 Respectfully submitted,

2 DATED: January 10, 2025

3 By: /s/ Lexi J. Hazam
LEXI J. HAZAM
4 **LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN &**
BERNSTEIN, LLP
275 BATTERY STREET, 29TH FLOOR
5 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3339
Telephone: 415-956-1000
6 lhazam@lchb.com

7 PREVIN WARREN
8 **MOTLEY RICE LLC**
401 9th Street NW Suite 630
9 Washington DC 20004
Telephone: 202-386-9610
10 pwarren@motleyrice.com

11 Co-Lead Counsel

12 CHRISTOPHER A. SEEGER
13 **SEEGER WEISS, LLP**
14 55 CHALLENGER ROAD, 6TH FLOOR
RIDGEFIELD PARK, NJ 07660
15 Telephone: 973-639-9100
cseeger@seegerweiss.com

16 Counsel to Co-Lead Counsel

17 JENNIE LEE ANDERSON
18 **ANDRUS ANDERSON, LLP**
19 155 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 900
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104
20 Telephone: 415-986-1400
jennie@andrusanderson.com

21 Liaison Counsel

22
23 EMILY C. JEFFCOTT
24 **MORGAN & MORGAN**
25 633 WEST FIFTH STREET, SUITE 2652
LOS ANGELES, CA 90071
26 Telephone: 213-787-8590
ejeffcott@forthepeople.com

27 JOSEPH VANZANDT
28 **BEASLEY ALLEN**
234 COMMERCE STREET

1 MONTGOMERY, LA 36103
2 Telephone: 334-269-2343
3 joseph.vanzandt@beasleyallen.com

4 Federal/State Liaisons

5 MATTHEW BERGMAN
6 GLENN DRAPER
7 **SOCIAL MEDIA VICTIMS LAW CENTER**
8 821 SECOND AVENUE, SUITE 2100
9 SEATTLE, WA 98104
Telephone: 206-741-4862
matt@socialmediavictims.org
glennglenn@socialmediavictims.org

10 JAMES J. BILSBORROW
11 **WEITZ & LUXENBERG, PC**
12 700 BROADWAY
13 NEW YORK, NY 10003
Telephone: 212-558-5500
jbilsborrow@weitzlux.com

14 JAYNE CONROY
15 **SIMMONS HANLY CONROY, LLC**
16 112 MADISON AVE, 7TH FLOOR
17 NEW YORK, NY 10016
Telephone: 917-882-5522
jconroy@simmonsfirm.com

18 ANDRE MURA
19 **GIBBS LAW GROUP, LLP**
20 1111 BROADWAY, SUITE 2100
21 OAKLAND, CA 94607
Telephone: 510-350-9717
amm@classlawgroup.com

22 ALEXANDRA WALSH
23 **WALSH LAW**
24 1050 Connecticut Ave, NW, Suite 500
25 Washington D.C. 20036
Telephone: 202-780-3014
awalsh@alexwalshlaw.com

26 MICHAEL M. WEINKOWITZ
27 **LEVIN SEDRAN & BERMAN, LLP**
28 510 WALNUT STREET
SUITE 500
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19106

1 Telephone: 215-592-1500
2 mweinkowitz@lfsbalw.com

3 Plaintiffs' Steering Committee Leadership

4 RON AUSTIN
5 **RON AUSTIN LAW**
6 400 MANHATTAN BLVD.
7 HARVEY, LA 70058
Telephone: 504-227-8100
raustin@ronaustinlaw.com

8 PAIGE BOLDT
9 **WALSH LAW**
10 4 Dominion Drive, Bldg. 3, Suite 100
San Antonio, TX 78257
11 Telephone: 210-448-0500
PBoldt@alexwalshlaw.com

12 THOMAS P. CARTMELL
13 **WAGSTAFF & CARTMELL LLP**
14 4740 Grand Avenue, Suite 300
Kansas City, MO 64112
15 Telephone: 816-701-1100
tcartmell@wcllp.com

16 SARAH EMERY
17 **HENDY JOHNSON VAUGHN EMERY PSC**
18 600 WEST MAIN STREET, SUITE 100
LOUISVILLE, KT 40202
19 Telephone: 859-600-6725
semery@justicestartshere.com

20 CARRIE GOLDBERG
21 **C.A. GOLDBERG, PLLC**
16 Court St.
22 Brooklyn, NY 11241
23 Telephone: 646-666-8908
carrie@cagoldberglaw.com

24 RONALD E. JOHNSON, JR.
25 **HENDY JOHNSON VAUGHN EMERY PSC**
26 600 WEST MAIN STREET, SUITE 100
LOUISVILLE, KT 40202
27 Telephone: 859-578-4444
rjohnson@justicestartshere.com

28 SIN-TING MARY LIU

1 **AYLSTOCK WITKIN KREIS &**
2 **OVERHOLTZ, PLLC**
3 17 EAST MAIN STREET, SUITE 200
4 PENSACOLA, FL 32502
5 Telephone: 510-698-9566
6 mliu@awkolaw.com

7 JAMES MARSH
8 **MARSH LAW FIRM PLLC**
9 31 HUDSON YARDS, 11TH FLOOR
10 NEW YORK, NY 10001-2170
11 Telephone: 212-372-3030
12 jamesmarsh@marshlaw.com

13 JOSEPH E. MELTER
14 **KESSLER TOPAZ MELTZER & CHECK**
15 **LLP**
16 280 KING OF PRUSSIA ROAD
17 RADNOR, PA 19087
18 Telephone: 610-667-7706
19 jmeltzer@ktmc.com

20 HILLARY NAPPI
21 **HACH & ROSE LLP**
22 112 Madison Avenue, 10th Floor
23 New York, New York 10016
24 Telephone: 212-213-8311
25 hnappi@hrsclaw.com

26 EMMIE PAULOS
27 **LEVIN PAPANTONIO RAFFERTY**
28 316 SOUTH BAYLEN STREET, SUITE 600
1 PENSACOLA, FL 32502
2 Telephone: 850-435-7107
3 epaulos@levinlaw.com

4 RUTH THI RIZKALLA
5 **THE CARLSON LAW FIRM, PC**
6 1500 ROSECRANS AVE., STE. 500
7 MANHATTAN BEACH, CA 90266
8 Telephone: 415-308-1915
9 rrizkalla@carlsonattorneys.com

10 ROLAND TELLIS
11 DAVID FERNANDES
12 **BARON & BUDD, P.C.**
13 15910 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 1600
14 Encino, CA 91436

1 Telephone: 818-839-2333
2 rtellis@baronbudd.com
3 dfernandes@baronbudd.com

4 MELISSA YEATES
5 **KESSLER TOPAZ MELTZER & CHECK**
6 **LLP**
7 280 KING OF PRUSSIA ROAD
RADNOR, PA 19087
Telephone: 610-667-7706
myeates@ktmc.com

8 DIANDRA "FU" DEBROSSE
9 ZIMMERMANN
10 **DICELLO LEVITT**
11 505 20th St North
Suite 1500
Birmingham, Alabama 35203
Telephone: 205-855-5700
fu@dicellosevitt.com

12 Plaintiffs' Steering Committee Membership

13 *Attorneys for Individual Plaintiffs*

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PHILIP J. WEISER

Attorney General
State of Colorado

/s/ Krista Batchelder

Krista Batchelder (CO Reg.45066),
pro hac vice
Deputy Solicitor General
Shannon Stevenson (CO Reg. 35542),
pro hac vice
Solicitor General
Elizabeth Orem (CO Reg. 58309), pro hac vice
Assistant Attorney General
Colorado Department of Law
Ralph L. Carr Judicial Center
Consumer Protection Section
1300 Broadway, 7th Floor
Denver, CO 80203
Phone: (720) 508-6384
krista.batchelder@coag.gov
Shannon.stevenson@coag.gov
Elizabeth.orem@coag.gov

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Colorado, ex rel.
Philip J. Weiser, Attorney General*

ROB BONTA

Attorney General
State of California

/s/ *Megan O'Neill*

Nicklas A. Akers (CA SBN 211222)
Senior Assistant Attorney General
Bernard Eskandari (SBN 244395)
Emily Kalanithi (SBN 256972)
Supervising Deputy Attorneys General
Nayha Arora (CA SBN 350467)
Megan O'Neill (CA SBN 343535)
Joshua Olszewski-Jubelirer (CA SBN 336428)
Marissa Roy (CA SBN 318773)
Brendan Ruddy (CA SBN 297896)
Deputy Attorneys General
California Department of Justice
Office of the Attorney General
455 Golden Gate Ave., Suite 11000
San Francisco, CA 94102-7004
Phone: (415) 510-4400

1 Fax: (415) 703-5480
 2 Megan.Oneill@doj.ca.gov

3 *Attorneys for Plaintiff the People of the State of*
 4 *California*

5 **RUSSELL COLEMAN**
 6 Attorney General
 7 Commonwealth of Kentucky

8 /s/ Philip Heleringer
 9 J. Christian Lewis (KY Bar No. 87109),
 10 *Pro hac vice*
 11 Philip Heleringer (KY Bar No. 96748),
 12 *Pro hac vice*
 13 Zachary Richards (KY Bar No. 99209),
 14 *Pro hac vice*
 15 Daniel I. Keiser (KY Bar No. 100264),
 16 *Pro hac vice*
 17 Matthew Cocanougher (KY Bar No. 94292),
 18 *Pro hac vice*
 19 Assistant Attorneys General
 20 1024 Capital Center Drive, Suite 200
 21 Frankfort, KY 40601
 22 CHRISTIAN.LEWIS@KY.GOV
 23 PHILIP.HELERINGER@KY.GOV
 24 ZACH.RICHARDS@KY.GOV
 25 DANIEL.KEISER@KY.GOV
 26 MATTHEW.COCAPOUGHHER@KY.GOV
 27 Phone: (502) 696-5300
 28 Fax: (502) 564-2698

20 *Attorneys for Plaintiff the Commonwealth of*
 21 *Kentucky*

22 **MATTHEW J. PLATKIN**
 23 Attorney General
 24 State of New Jersey

25 /s/ Thomas Huynh
 26 Kashif T. Chand (NJ Bar No. 016752008),
 27 *Pro hac vice*
 28 Section Chief, Deputy Attorney General
 Thomas Huynh (NJ Bar No. 200942017),
Pro hac vice
 Assistant Section Chief, Deputy Attorney

1 General
2 Verna J. Pradaxay (NJ Bar No. 335822021),
3 *Pro hac vice*
4 Mandy K. Wang (NJ Bar No. 373452021),
5 *Pro hac vice*
6 Deputy Attorneys General
7 New Jersey Office of the Attorney General,
8 Division of Law
9 124 Halsey Street, 5th Floor
Newark, NJ 07101
Tel: (973) 648-2052
Kashif.Chand@law.njoag.gov
Thomas.Huynh@law.njoag.gov
Verna.Pradaxay@law.njoag.gov
Mandy.Wang@law.njoag.gov

10 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs New Jersey Attorney*
11 *General and the New Jersey Division of*
12 *Consumer Affairs Matthew J. Platkin, Attorney*
13 *General for the State of New Jersey, and Cari*
14 *Fais, Acting Director of the New Jersey Division*
15 *of Consumer Affairs*

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
2

3 By: /s/Ashley M. Simonsen
4 Ashley M. Simonsen, SBN 275203
5 COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
6 1999 Avenue of the Stars
7 Los Angeles, CA 90067
8 Telephone: (424) 332-4800
9 Facsimile: + 1 (424) 332-4749
10 Email: asimonsen@cov.com

11 Phyllis A. Jones, *pro hac vice*
12 Paul W. Schmidt, *pro hac vice*
13 COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
14 One City Center
15 850 Tenth Street, NW
16 Washington, DC 20001-4956
17 Telephone: + 1 (202) 662-6000
18 Facsimile: + 1 (202) 662-6291
19 Email: pajones@cov.com

20 Attorney for Defendants Meta Platforms, Inc.
21 f/k/a Facebook, Inc.; Facebook Holdings,
22 LLC; Facebook Operations, LLC; Facebook
23 Payments, Inc.; Facebook Technologies, LLC;
24 Instagram, LLC; Siculus, Inc.; and Mark Elliot
25 Zuckerberg

26 KING & SPALDING LLP
27

28 By: /s/ Geoffrey M. Drake
1 Geoffrey M. Drake, *pro hac vice*
2 TaCara D. Harris, *pro hac vice*
3 1180 Peachtree Street, NE, Suite 1600
4 Atlanta, GA 30309-3521
5 Telephone: (404) 572-4600
6 Facsimile: (404) 572-5100
7 Email: gdrake@kslaw.com
8 tharris@kslaw.com

9 Kristen R. Fournier, *pro hac vice*
10 KING & SPALDING LLP
11 1185 Avenue of the Americas, 34th Floor
12 New York, NY 10036-2601
13 Telephone: (212) 556-2100
14 Facsimile: (212) 556-2222
15 Email: kfournier@kslaw.com
16 David P. Mattern, *pro hac vice*

1 KING & SPALDING LLP
 2 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 900
 3 Washington, DC 20006-4707
 4 Telephone: (202) 737-0500
 Facsimile: (202) 626-3737
 Email: dmattern@kslaw.com

5 Bailey J. Langner (SBN 307753)
 6 KING & SPALDING LLP
 7 50 California Street, Suite 3300
 San Francisco, CA 94111
 8 Telephone: (415) 318-1200
 Facsimile: (415) 318-1300
 Email: blangner@kslaw.com

9
 10 Andrea Roberts Pierson, *pro hac vice*
 11 FAEGRE DRINKER LLP
 12 300 N. Meridian Street, Suite 2500
 Indianapolis, IN 46204
 Telephone: + 1 (317) 237-0300
 Facsimile: + 1 (317) 237-1000
 Email: andrea.pierson@faegredrinker.com

13
 14 Amy R. Fiterman, *pro hac vice*
 15 FAEGRE DRINKER LLP
 16 2200 Wells Fargo Center
 17 90 South Seventh Street
 Minneapolis, MN 55402
 Telephone: +1 (612) 766-7768
 Facsimile: +1 (612) 766-1600
 Email: amy.fiterman@faegredrinker.com

18
 19 Attorneys for Defendants TikTok Inc., ByteDance
 20 Inc., TikTok Ltd., ByteDance Ltd., and TikTok
 21 LLC

22
 23 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
By: /s/ Jonathan H. Blavin
 24 Jonathan H. Blavin, SBN 230269
 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
 25 560 Mission Street, 27th Floor
 San Francisco, CA 94105-3089
 Telephone: (415) 512-4000
 Facsimile: (415) 512-4077
 Email: jonathan.blavin@mto.com

26
 27 Rose L. Ehler (SBN 29652)

1 Victoria A. Degtyareva (SBN 284199)
 2 Laura M. Lopez, (SBN 313450)
 3 Ariel T. Teshuva (SBN 324238)
 4 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
 5 350 South Grand Avenue, 50th Floor
 6 Los Angeles, CA 90071-3426
 7 Telephone: (213) 683-9100
 Facsimile: (213) 687-3702
 Email: rose.ehler@mto.com
 Email: victoria.degtyareva@mto.com
 Email: Ariel.Teshuva@mto.com

8 Lauren A. Bell (*pro hac vice forthcoming*)
 9 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
 10 601 Massachusetts Ave., NW St.,
 Suite 500 E
 Washington, D.C. 20001-5369
 11 Telephone: (202) 220-1100
 Facsimile: (202) 220-2300
 Email: lauren.bell@mto.com

13 *Attorneys for Defendant Snap Inc.*

14 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
 15 Professional Corporation
 16 By: /s/ Brian M. Willen
 Brian M. Willen (*pro hac vice*)
 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
 17 1301 Avenue of the Americas, 40th Floor
 New York, New York 10019
 18 Telephone: (212) 999-5800
 Facsimile: (212) 999-5899
 Email: bwillen@wsgr.com

21 Lauren Gallo White (SBN 309075)
 22 Samantha A. Machock (SBN 298852)
 23 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
 One Market Plaza, Spear Tower, Suite 3300
 San Francisco, CA 94105
 24 Telephone: (415) 947-2000
 Facsimile: (415) 947-2099
 Email: lwhite@wsgr.com
 Email: smachock@wsgr.com

26 Christopher Chiou (SBN 233587)
 27 Matthew K. Donohue (SBN 302144)
 28 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
 953 East Third Street, Suite 100

1 Los Angeles, CA 90013
2 Telephone: (323) 210-2900
3 Facsimile: (866) 974-7329
4 Email: cchiou@wsgr.com
Email: mdonohue@wsgr.com

5 *Attorneys for Defendants YouTube, LLC and
Google LLC*

6 WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP
7 By: /s/ *Joseph G. Petrosinelli*
Joseph G. Petrosinelli (*pro hac vice*)
jpetrosinelli@wc.com
8 Ashley W. Hardin (*pro hac vice*)
ahardin@wc.com
680 Maine Avenue, SW
9 Washington, DC 20024
Telephone.: 202-434-5000
Fax: 202-434-5029

10 *Attorneys for Defendants YouTube, LLC and
Google LLC*

11 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
By: /s/ *Yardena R. Zwang-Weissman*
Yardena R. Zwang-Weissman (SBN 247111)
300 South Grand Avenue, 22nd Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071-3132
Tel.: 213.612.7238
Email: yardena.zwang-
weissman@morganlewis.com

12 Brian Ercole (*pro hac vice*)
600 Brickell Avenue, Suite 1600
13 Miami, FL 33131-3075
Tel.: 305.415.3416
Email: brian.ercole@morganlewis.com

14 Stephanie Schuster (*pro hac vice*)
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
15 NW Washington, DC 20004-2541
Tel.: 202.373.6595
Email: stephanie.schuster@morganlewis.com

16 *Attorneys for Defendants YouTube, LLC and
Google LLC*

ATTESTATION

I, Lexi J. Hazam, hereby attest, pursuant to N.D. Cal. Civil L.R. 5-1, that the concurrence to the filing of this document has been obtained from each signatory hereto.

Dated: January 10, 2025

By: /s/ Lexi J. Hazam